

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Adrian Tyrell Eaglin,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. 0:08-2547-TLW-PJG
	)	
	)	
Mr. James Metts, Sheriff; ABL	)	
Management, Inc.; Sgt. Barrington Butler;	)	
Sgt. Linda Mickens; Ofc. Troy Hall; Ofc.	)	
Isaac Jackson; Ofc. Jeff Derrick; Ofc.	)	
Donyelle Williams; Sgt. Valerie Allen;	)	
Ofc. Floyd Hopkins; Ofc. C.O. Coleman;	)	
Doctor Lance Williams; Nurse Kim	)	
Christie; Jane/John Doe, Prison Health	)	
Services,	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, Adrian Tyrell Eaglin (“plaintiff”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on July 16, 2008. (Doc. #1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, to whom this case had previously been assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends the defendants’ motions for summary judgment (Doc. # 62 and # 90), be granted. (Doc. # 133). The plaintiff filed objections to the Report on March 17, 2010. (Doc. # 140). This Court has carefully reviewed the file in this case, including the medical record. In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final

determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 133). In light of this decision, all remaining motions are deemed **MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

March 22, 2010  
Florence, South Carolina